

JAN GRAHAM ATTORNEY GENERAL

DECEIVE
JUN 1 0 1998
DIV. OF OIL, GAS & MINING

CAROL CLAWSON Solicitor General

REED RICHARDS
Chief Deputy Attorney General

PALMER DEPAULIS Chief of Staff

June 8, 1998

Lowell Braxton
Acting Director
Utah Division of Oil, Gas &
Mining
1594 West North Temple,
Suite 1210, Box 145801
Salt Lake City, UT
84114-5801

Mary Ann Wright
Deputy Director of Mining
Utah Division of Oil, Gas &
Mining
1594 West North Temple,
Suite 1210, Box 145801
Salt Lake City, UT
84114-5801

Dave Lauriski Chairman Utah Board of Oil, Gas & Mining c/o Energy West Mining Co. 739 East 2900 South Box 7 Price, UT 84501

Re: Castle Valley Special Service District v. Board of Oil, Gas & Mining

Dear Lowell, Mary Ann, and Dave:

For your information about the status of the above appeal, enclosed please find a copy of my settlement letter of June 8, 1998 to counsel for the Water Users.

Very truly yours,

Patrick J. O'Hara

Assistant Attorney General

cc: Daniel G. Moquin, Esq. (w/encl) Encl.



JAN GRAHAM ATTORNEY GENERAL

DECEIVE
JUN 1 0 1998
DIV. OF OIL, GAS & MINING

ATTORNEY GENERAL
REED RICHARDS

PALMER DEPAULIS
Chief of Staff

CAROL CLAWSON Solicitor General

June 8, 1998

Chief Deputy Attorney General

J. Craig Smith, Esq. NIELSEN & SENIOR, P.C. 1100 Eagle Gate Tower 60 East So. Temple Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Jeffrey W. Appel, Esq.
Benjamin T. Wilson, Esq.
APPEL & WARLAUMONT
1100 Boston Building
9 Exchange Place
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Re: Castle Valley Special Service District v. Board of Oil, Gas & Mining

Dear Craig, Jeff and Ben:

I am writing with regard to our recent settlement discussions concerning the above appeal to the Utah Supreme Court. This letter is in response to the draft "Stipulated Settlement Agreement" sent by Ben Wilson to Craig Smith, Dan Moquin and me by email on May 15, 1998 and, in a modified form, again on May 18, 1998 (the "May Draft").

The bottom line is that the May Draft is not acceptable to the Board of Oil, Gas & Mining (the Board"), whom I represent in this matter, and the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining ("DOGM"), whom Dan Moquin represents. This letter explains why, and concludes with an alternative settlement proposal.

The Board and DOGM are regulatory agencies with a wide range of duties concerning hydrological issues imposed on them (and those whom they regulate) under Utah's federally-mandated regulatory program for coal mining. Under law, the Board and DOGM are duty-bound to apply the coal regulatory law fairly and impartially to all persons who come before the agencies, including, of course, Co-Op Mining Co. (the "Operator") and members of the public, such your clients (the "Water Users").

m-jcs2.698



Messrs. Smith, Appel & Wilson

June 8, 1998

Page 2

Under all the circumstances, the Board and DOGM are not willing to change their regulatory relationship with the parties. Rather than voluntarily assuming extra and special contractual duties applicable only to the Operator and the Water Users, the Board and DOGM desire to maintain the existing, neutral, arms-length regulatory relationship with all parties based solely on the legal requirements of the Utah Coal Program. Detailed settlement negotiations based on the May Draft simply would not bear fruit.

Although the Operator has, so far at least, prevailed in this case concerning the Water Users' challenge to its five year permit renewal, the Water Users and the Operator still, as between themselves, might be able to negotiate a reasonable side settlement agreement on water monitoring issues. Indeed, the Board and DOGM routinely encourage management of disputing parties to meet with each other. When they meet with an open mind, parties to long-standing disputes often can find common ground through less expensive (and less formal) avenues of alternative dispute resolution. Perhaps the Water Users' management team will be able to persuade the Operator's management team voluntarily to assume extra water monitoring burdens which go beyond the numerous requirements already imposed on the Operator under the State's comprehensive coal regulatory program.

The Board and DOGM do not need to be parties to a private water monitoring contract. The Board and DOGM are not opposed to any side settlement agreement between the Water Users and the Operator, so long as (1) such a side-agreement does not purport to alter, diminish or frustrate any of the Operator's non-negotiable hydrological duties under the State's coal regulatory program, and (2) such a side-agreement does not purport to enlarge or diminish the non-negotiable jurisdiction, legal duties and administrative prerogatives of the relevant State and/or federal agencies.

Finally, while every case comes with its inherent quotient of litigation risk, the Board and DOGM sincerely feel that the Board's comprehensive and well-reasoned 64-page decision of March 6, 1998 on the collateral estoppel question has a reasonably good chance of being affirmed on appeal by the Utah Supreme Court. The Board and DOGM, therefore, jointly propose a simple, straight-forward settlement mechanism whereby the Water Users and the other parties merely stipulate and move for an order that the appeal to the Supreme Court shall be dismissed with prejudice, with the parties to bear

Messrs. Smith, Appel & Wilson June 8, 1998 Page 3

their respective attorneys fees and costs. If the Board's and DOGM's settlement proposal is acceptable to your clients, please let me know and I will be happy to draft and circulate to all counsel a "Stipulation, Motion and Order of Dismissal" consistent with this paragraph.

Very truly yours,

Patrick J. O'Hara

Assistant Attorney General

Patril J. Oilane

cc:

Daniel G. Moquin, Esq. Assistant Attorney General Utah Attorney General's Office 1594 West North Temple, Suite 300 P.O. Box 140855 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0855



Michael O. Leavitt Governor Ted Stewart Executive Director Lowell P. Braxton Division Director 1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210 PO Box 145801 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801 801-538-5340 801-359-3940 (Fax) 801-538-7223 (TDD)

May 8, 1998

James L. Warlaumont Appel & Warlaumont 1100 Boston Building 9 Exchange Place Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Re: <u>Docket Number 95-025 Request for Informal Hearing Transcripts to be Included in the Record on Appeal</u>

Dear Mr. Warlaumont:

I am responding to your letter of April 30, 1998 requesting that I reconsider my denial to include the transcripts for the Informal Hearing held October 17, 1996, November 8, 1996 and February 28, 1997 in the record for the appeal of Docket Number 95-025. In reviewing your request I remain convinced that my original decision not to include transcripts from the informal hearing was justified.

For additional information on this position, please refer to Final Order of the Board of Oil, Gas and Mining, March 6, 1998, Docket No. 95-025, Cause No. ACT/015/025, page 12, E. Standard of Review which reads: "The threshold question of collateral estoppel is a question of law which the Board reviews de novo for correctness. The Board is not obligated to defer to Director Carter's resolution of the question on remand."

Sincerely,

Lowell P. Braxton

Acting Director

dr

cc: P. O'Hara

D. Moquin

C. Allred

Notice to Mailer of Correction in Add	lre ce
Addressee's Account Number (All numbers, dates, and letters)	No account number on mail
Suare K. Yensen Pros Board 01	Siector 5
Old Address (Include apartment or suite number) Huntington Cleve	land irrig (o
City, State, and ZIP Code BN 395 (leu	eland- 44.84518
New Address (Include apartment or suite number)	
City, State, and ZIP Code Cleveland · Ut	- 84518-0093
This card is furnished: For address correction, as requested. In place of Form 3579 (see reason forms)	
	eason for nondelivery:
PS Form 3547 , June 1995	



OCT 2 0 1997

SECRETARY, BOARD JF OIL, GAS & MINING

F. Mark Hansen, #5078 624 North 300 West, Suite 200 Salt Lake City, Utah 84103 Telephone: (801) 533-2700

Carl E. Kingston, #1826 3212 South State Street Salt Lake City, Utah 84115 (801)486-1458

Attorneys for Co-op Mining Company

BEFORE THE BOARD OF OIL, GAS AND MINING DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, STATE OF UTAH

IN THE MATTER OF THE () FIVE-YEAR PERMIT RENEWAL,) CO-OP MINING COMPANY, () BEAR CANYON MINE, () EMERY COUNTY, UTAH ()	NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS
)	Docket No. 95-025
)	Cause No. ACT/015/025

Notice is here given that, effective Monday, October 20, 1997, the office of F. Mark Hansen and the law firm of F. Mark Hansen, P.C. is changed. The new location is:

404 East 4500 South, Suite B-34 Salt Lake City, Utah 84107 Telephone: (801) 266-2882 Telecopier: (801) 266-2888

DATED this // day of October, 1997.

Attorney for Co-op Mining Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify on October <u>//</u>, 1997 I served the above document by first class mail to:

J. Craig Smith
David B. Hartvigsen
NIELSEN & SENIOR
60 East South Temple, Suite 1100
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Attorneys for
North Emery Water Users' Association and
Huntington-Cleveland Irrigation Company

Jeffrey W. Appel
Benjamin T. Wilson
COLLARD, APPEL & WARLAUMONT
9 Exchange Place, Suite 1100
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Attorneys for
Castle Valley Special Service District

Mark Hansen

Daniel G. Moquin Assistant Attorney General 1594 West North Temple, Suite 300 P.O. Box 140855 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0855 Attorney for Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

2006p.008

- 2 -

LAW OFFICES OF

F. MARK HANSEN, P.C.

624 NORTH 300 WEST, SUITE 200 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84103 TELEPHONE: (801) 533-2700 FAX: (801) 533-2736 ADMITTED TO PRACTICE IN UTAH, ARIZONA, COLORADO AND NEVADA.

NEVADA OFFICE:

5675 S. VALLEY VIEW, #200 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89118 TELEPHONE: (702) 798-0125

November 29, 1996

James W. Carter Utah Division of Oil, Gas & Mining 355 West North Temple 3 Triad Center, Suuite 350 Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203 Via facsimile (801)359-3940

RE: C.W. Mining Co. permit renewal — DOGM hearing on Water Users' protest

Dear Mr. Carter.

C.W. Mining Company would like to put on evidence before the informal conference is closed. I anticipate requiring about three hours, not including cross-examination. Please have someone from your office coordinate with me for available dates.

Sincerely,

F. Mark Hansen

2006-1.002



.ail this card to all people, businesses and publications who send you mail. For publications, tape an old address label over name and old address sections and complete new address. COMPLETE ADDRESS PORTION ON FRONT OF FORM with Name, Street Address, City, State and ZIP Code of Individual or Business to whom you are relaying this card.

Your	Print or Type—Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial		
Name	North Emery Water Users as	00	
Old	No. and Street Apt./Suite P.O. Box R.D. No. Rural Box No.		
Address	City and State ZIP + 4 Code XI452 /-		
New Address	No. and Street Apt./Suite P.O. Box R.D. No. Rural Box No.		
Address	City and State Cleveland Ut 845181-111		
Sign Here	Signature Date new address in effect Keyline No. (if any)		
	Lura Filmore		

PS FORM 3576, 11/92

RECEIVER: Be sure to record the above new address in your address book at home or office

Michael O. Leavitt Governor Ted Stewart Executive Director

355 West North Temple 3 Triad Center, Suite 350 Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203 801-538-5340 James W. Carter | 801-359-3940 (Fax)
Division Director | 801-538-5319 (TDD)

December 11, 1995

Jeffrey W. Appel Collard, Appel, and Warlaumont, L.C. 1100 Boston Building 9 Exchange Place Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Co-Op Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, Folder #2, ACT/015/025, Emery

County, Utah

Dear Jeff:

Re:

I am writing to further explain and, I hope, clarify the decision of November 2, 1995, made by the Division with regard to renewal of the Bear Canyon mine permit. Pursuant to R645-303-230, "a valid permit, issued pursuant to the state program, will carry with it the right of successive renewal, within the approved boundaries of the existing permit, upon expiration of the term of the permit." Co-Op's Bear Canyon permit was due to expire November 2, 1995. On June 16, 1995, Co-Op submitted a permit renewal application for the Bear Canyon Mine and on August 29, 1995, Co-Op initiated the required public notice.

R645-303-233 sets forth the Division's approval process for renewal applications. R645-233.100 sets forth criteria for approval. R645-233.200 provides as follows: "Burden of Proof. In the determination of whether to approve or deny a renewal of a permit come under the burden of proof will be on the opponents of renewal." R647-300-131.110, et seq. provides that application reviews will not exceed 120 days for permit renewals. Taken together, the Division has interpreted the Coal Regulatory Program rules to require renewal of valid and subsisting coal permit with 120 days of submittal of the application for renewal, before expiration of the permit, in the absence of a showing of facts which would make such renewal an improvident permit issuance. In this instance, although an objection to renewal was timely filed, no such showing was made on or before November 2, 1995, and the Division, therefore, had no basis to take any action other than to approve the renewal.





Page 2 Jeff Appel December 11, 1995

The issues raised by the water users' objections go directly to conclusions which underpin the Division's findings necessary to the issuance and continued viability of Co-Op's permit. Because the issues raised by the water users go directly to findings which support the permit's continued viability, they are objections which may be raised at any time during the permit's life. The remedies sought by the water users, to further condition the existing permit to ensure protection of the quantity and quality of the water users sources, and to either revoke or modify the permit to include adequate provisions for maintenance, testing, exploration, protection and remediation of adverse impacts to the water users' sources, are all remedies available to any adversely affected party upon a showing of facts which would cause the Division to change its conclusions and findings with regard to a mine's hydrologic impacts. The Division has the administrative ability to implement any changed findings by requiring modifications to the permit, or could determine that the impacts are irreparable and that the mining permit itself should be revoked. In other words, the objections raised and remedies requested by the water users in the context of the renewal process may be raised by any party at any time.

The Division has acknowledged that those issues and requests have been made and has agreed to schedule an informal conference to take evidence and argument concerning those allegations at the time and place requested by the water users. It is the Division's position that the water users have not been prejudiced by the Division's decision of November 2nd, to renew the Bear Canyon permit, and that the Division is providing every reasonable opportunity to the water users to complete their fact finding and case preparation before being required to appear at the requested informal conference. The Division is ready to provide you and your clients with any information you may need and we stand ready to act upon any request for administrative discovery or other procedural matters.

I hope this will allay your concerns and those of your clients that the Division's November 2 renewal decision has foreclosed their administrative remedies.

Very truly yours

James W. Carter

Director

bn BCANYON